IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application   : **10/562,872**

Applicant(s)   : **FROIDCOEUR et al.**

Filed   : **12/29/2005**

Confirmation   : **6756**

T.C./Art Unit   : **2444**

Examiner   : **HUSSAIN, Farrukh**

Atty. Docket   : **NL030821US**

Title: **EMBEDDING A UPNP AV MEDIASERVER OBJECT ID IN A URI**

Mail Stop: **APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS**
Commissioner for Patents
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL UNDER 37 CFR 41.37

Sir:

   This is an appeal from the decision of the Examiner dated 30 July 2010, finally rejecting claims 1-18 and 20-27 of the subject application.

   This paper includes (each beginning on a separate sheet):

1. **Appeal Brief;**
2. **Claims Appendix;**
3. **Evidence Appendix; and**
4. **Related Proceedings Appendix.**

APPEAL BRIEF

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The above-identified application is assigned, in its entirety, to

Koninklijke Philips Electronics N. V.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellant is not aware of any co-pending appeal or interference that will directly affect, or be directly affected by, or have any bearing on, the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claim 19 is canceled.

Claims 1-18 and 20-27 are pending in the application.

Claims 13-21 stand rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 1-18 and 20-27 stand rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

These rejected claims are the subject of this appeal.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No amendments were filed subsequent to the final rejection in the Office Action dated 30 July 2010.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER[1]

The invention addresses a UPnP-compliant Media-Renderer and Control-Point (MR-CP) combination. A URI (Uniform Resource Identifier) representation of a Content Directory Service (CDS) description at a Media-Server (MS) is sent to the MR-CP combination, along with an identifier of an object on the MS. The MR portion of the combination uses the object identifier to obtain and playback the object. The CP portion of the combination uses the description of the content directory to automatically playback subsequent content items using the context provided by the content directory (Applicants' specification, page 5, lines 17-24). That is, for example, the CP portion may provide the object identifier of the next object in the directory for the MR portion to playback (page 5, lines 24-26). In a preferred embodiment, the CP portion of the combination also allows a user to browse the content directory, and select particular objects at the MS for playback by the MR portion (page 5, lines 30-34).

Independent claim 1 recites a method of enabling a UPnP-compliant MediaRenderer-Control Point combination (202-204 of FIG. 2) to use an organizational context of a content item as represented in a UPnP Content Directory Service, the method comprising enabling the combination to receive a URI representative of a Content Directory Service description (page 5, lines 17-19).

Dependent claim 2 recites the method of claim 1, comprising enabling the combination to receive the URI together with an objectID representative of the content item (page 5, lines 21-23).

---

[1] It is respectfully noted that it is not the appellants' intention that the claimed embodiments of this invention be limited to operation within the example embodiments described in this brief, beyond what is required by the claim language. These examples and their description are provided to facilitate ease of understanding and to comply with the requirements of an appeal brief, without intending that any further interpreted limitations be read into the claims as presented.

Appl. No. 10/562,872
Appeal Brief in Response
to final Office action of **30 July 2010**

Page 4 of 22

Dependent claim 3 recites the method of claim 1, comprising providing a ProtocolInfo string referring to the content item and the organizational context for enabling the combination to retrieve a further URI representative of the content item for being streamed using a streaming protocol (page 5, lines 26-29).

Independent claim 5 recites an electronic device comprising a UPnP-compliant MediaRenderer-Control Point combination (202-204 of FIG. 2) configured to exploit an organizational context of a content item as represented in a UPnP Content Directory Service, the device being configured to process a URI representative of the Content Directory description (page 5, lines 17-19).

Dependent claim 6 recites the device of claim 5, configured to process an objectID, representative of the content item, together with the URI (page 5, lines 21-23).

Dependent claim 7 recites the device of claim 5, configured to process a ProtocolInfo string referring to the content item and the organizational context for enabling the combination to retrieve a further URI representative of the content item for being streamed using a streaming protocol (page 5, lines 26-29).

Independent claim 9 recites control software stored on a non-transient computer-readable medium for installation on and execution by a UPnP-compliant MediaRenderer-Control Point combination (202-204 of FIG. 2) for enabling the MediaRenderer to exploit an organizational context of a content item as represented in a UPnP Content Directory Service, the software being configured to process a URI representative of the Content Directory Service description (page 5, lines 17-19).

Dependent claim 10 recites the control software of claim 9, configured to process an objectID, representative of the content item, together with the URI (page 5, lines 21-23).

Dependent claim 11 recites the control software of claim 9, configured to process a ProtocolInfo string referring to the content item and the organizational context for enabling the combination to retrieve a further URI representative of the content item for being streamed using a streaming protocol (page 5, lines 26-29).

Independent claim 13 recites a device (202-204 of FIG. 2) comprising:

a UPnP interface;

a renderer that is configured to render content received from at least one media server; and

a controller that is configured to control reception of the content from the media server;

wherein:

the controller is configured to receive a URI via the UPnP interface from an external UPnP Control Point, for receiving a content directory from the media server that provides an organization context of an item of the content at the media server, and to control selection of at least one subsequent item of the content based on the content directory (page 5, line 30 - page 6, line 8).

Dependent claim 20 recites the device of claim 13, wherein the controller is configured to receive the URI together with an identifier of the item for rendering the item (page 5, lines 21-23).

Dependent claim 21 recites the device of claim 13, wherein the controller is configured to receive a UPnP ProtocolInfo string that refers to the item and the organizational context to facilitate receiving the item from the media server (page 5, lines 26-29).

Independent claim 22 recites a method for execution on a UPnP media renderer (202-204 of FIG. 2) comprising:

receiving an identification of a content item at a media server to be rendered, and a URI corresponding to a context of the content item within the media server, from an external controller (page 6, lines 9-15),

receiving the content item from the media server based on the identification (page 2, lines 27-30),

receiving the context of the content item based on the URI (page 5, lines 17-20),

rendering the content item at the UPnP media renderer (page 2, line 21),

determining a subsequent content item at the media server to be rendered, based on the context (page 5, lines 23-26), and

rendering the subsequent content item (page 6, lines 2-8).

Dependent claim 24 recites the method of claim 22, wherein the external controller corresponds to a UPnP Control Point (106, 206 of FIG. 2, page 8, line 32 - page 9, line 1).

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Claims 13-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, 13-18, and 20-27[2] stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) Weast (USP 7,454,511) and Salmonsen et al. (USPA 2003/0220781, hereinafter Salmonsen).

Claims 4, 8, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Weast, Salmonsen, and Saulpaugh et al. (USP7,065,574, hereinafter Saulpaugh).

---

[2] The Office action refers to claims 13-27; however, claim 19 has been canceled.

VII. ARGUMENT

Claims 13-18 and 20-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 13-18 and 20-21

The Examiner asserts that the claimed device of claim 13 "could be software. There is nothing in the specification [that] would lead one to believe that the media server is a (sic) hardware... There is no hardware in claim 13." This assertion is incorrect.

Claim 13 claims a device that includes a UPnP interface, a renderer that renders received content, and a controller that controls reception of content from a media server. The applicants respectfully note that software, per se, cannot be said to be a "device", and, more specifically, cannot render received content, and cannot control the reception of content from a media server.

Software, by itself, cannot perform any function. In order to perform a function, software must be executed by a physical processing device. Software, without hardware, cannot render content material, and cannot affect reception of such content material. Software, without hardware, cannot form an interface with a UPnP network.

Because the device of claim 13, including an interface, a renderer, and a controller must include hardware in order to perform the claimed functions of the device, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 13-18 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. 101 is unwarranted, and should be reversed by the Board.

Further, the Examiner specifically refers to the "media server" as a software element that causes claim 13 to be directed to non-statutory subject matter. The applicants note that claim 13 recites receiving and rendering content from a media server. The characteristics of the media server from which the claimed device receives content is irrelevant to the issue of whether the claimed device includes statutory subject matter.

Because the characteristics of the media server forms the basis of the Examiner's rejection, and the characteristics of the media server is irrelevant to the elements of the applicant's claim, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 13-18 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. 101 is unwarranted, and should be reversed by the Board.

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, 13-18, and 20-27 stand rejected under
35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Weast and Salmonsen

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, and 13-27

The combination of Weast and Salmonsen fails to teach or suggest receiving a URI from an external UPnP Control Point, for receiving a URI representative of a Content Directory Service description, as specifically claimed in claim 1, upon which claims 2-4 depend. Independent claims 5, 9, 13, and 22, upon which each of the other claims depends, include similar features.

The Examiner acknowledges that Weast fails to teach or suggest receiving a URI representative of a Content Directory Service description, and asserts that Salmonsen provides this teaching at paragraphs [0123] and [0012]. This assertion is incorrect.

At the cited text, Salmonsen discloses:

"The media directory 518 is a media container, holding a list of all available media content and possibly some or all of the media content. The media directory 518 operates as a virtual media directory, enabling and facilitating access to locally-stored media content and remote media contained by other servers and devices. The media directory 518 stores Uniform Resource Identifiers (URIs) that identify content resources. URIs includes WWW addresses, Universal Document Identifiers, Universal Resource Identifiers, and combinations of Uniform Resource Locators (URL) and Names (URN). Uniform Resource Identifiers are formatted strings that identify a resource by name, location, or another characteristic. The media directory 518 holds URIs of all files that the server 500 can deliver for rendering. The URIs can correspond to files stored anywhere." (Salmonsen [0123].)

"In accordance with further additional aspects of the disclosed system, some embodiments may include a communication system comprising a media source, and a media renderer that renders media content in a native format. The media renderer is capable of communicating with the media source via an out-of-band transfer protocol. The communication system further comprises an emulator coupled to the media renderer and a control point. The emulator is capable of receiving media

content in a non-native format and emulating a native device to supply media content
to the media renderer in the native format. The control point communicates with the
media source and the media renderer using communication control actions that
select, enable, initiate, and manage emulated interactions." (Salmonsen [0012].)

As is clearly evident, Salmonsen discloses a media directory 518 that includes a
plurality of URIs, but nowhere in the cited text does Salmonsen address a URI that is
representative of this media directory 518. The fact that Salmonsen's media directory
518 includes URIs has no bearing on the existence of a URI that represent this media
directory, and, in particular, has no bearing on whether such a [non-existent] URI is
received by a MediaRenderer-Control Point combination.

Salmonsen does not teach or suggest the communication of the media
directory; Salmonsen only addresses the communication of media content and the
control signals used to effect such communication. Salmonsen's media directory 518
is located solely at Salmonsen's server 500, and Salmonsen does not teach or
suggest transmitting this directory 518, and in particular does not teach or suggest
transmitting a URI representation of this directory 518, so that it could be received at
a MR-CP combination, as asserted by the Examiner.

Because the combination of Weast and Salmonsen fails to teach or suggest
receiving a URI representative of a Content Directory Service description, and
because the text cited by the Examiner in support of this rejection fails to identify
where Salmonsen provides this teaching, the applicants respectfully maintain that the
rejection of claims 1-3, 5-7, 9-11, and 13-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Weast and
Salmonsen is unfounded, and should be reversed by the Board

Claims 9-12

The combination of Weast and Salmonsen fails to teach or suggest processing
a URI representation of a Content Directory Service description, as specifically
claimed in claim 9, upon which claims 10-12 depend.

The Examiner acknowledges that Weast fails to disclose processing a URI representative of the Content Directory Service description, and asserts that Salmonsen provides this teaching at [0019], [0123], and [0008]. This assertion is incorrect.

As noted above, Salmonsen does not disclose a URI that represents a directory description. At the cited text, Salmonsen discloses processing a media directory, directly; Salmonsen is silent with regard to a URI that represents a description of this directory, and silent with regard to processing such a [non-existent] URI representation.

Because the combination of Weast and Salmonsen fails to disclose processing a URI that is representative of the Content Directory Service description, and because the cited text relied upon by the Examiner fails to disclose processing such a URI representation, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 9-12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Weast and Salmonsen is unfounded, and should be reversed by the Board.

Claims 13-18 and 20-21

The combination of Weast and Salmonsen fails to teach or suggest receiving a URI via a UPnP interface from an external UPnP Control Point, fails to teach or suggest receiving a content directory from the media server, and fails to teach or suggest controlling selection of a subsequent item based on the content directory, as specifically claimed in claim 13, upon which claims 14-18 and 20-21 depend.

The Examiner acknowledges that Weast fails to disclose receiving a URI via a UPnP interface from an external UPnP Control Point, for receiving a content directory from the media server that provides an organization context of an item of the content at the media server, and asserts that Salmonsen provides this teaching at paragraph [0123] and [0012] (presented above). This assertion is incorrect.

As noted above, Salmonsen does not disclose a URI that represents a content directory. Additionally, Salmonsen does not disclose communicating a directory, or a URI that represents the directory, from an external UPnP Control Point. Nowhere in the cited text does Salmonsen disclose such a communication from an external UPnP Control Point, and the Examiner fails to address such communication in the rejection of claim 13.

Because the combination of Weast and Salmonsen fails to teach or suggest receiving a URI via a UPnP interface from an external UPnP Control Point, fails to teach or suggest receiving a content directory from the media server, and fails to teach or suggest controlling selection of a subsequent item based on the content directory, and because the cited text relied upon by the Examiner in support of this rejection does not provide these teachings, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 13-18 and 20-21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Weast and Salmonsen is unfounded, and should be reversed by the Board.

Claims 22-27

The combination of Weast and Salmonsen fails to teach or suggest receiving an identification of a content item at a media server to be rendered and a URI corresponding to a context of the content item within the media server from an external controller, fails to teach or suggest receiving the context of the content item based on the URI, and fails to teach or suggest determining and rendering a subsequent content item from the media server based on the context, as specifically claimed in claim 22, upon which claims 23-27 depend.

The Examiner acknowledges that Weast fails to disclose receiving an identification of a content item at a media server to be rendered and a URI corresponding to a context of the content item within the media server from an external controller, and fails to disclose receiving the context of the content item based on the URI, and asserts that Salmonsen provides these teachings at [0009], [0123], and [0012]. This assertion is incorrect.

The Examiner notes that Salmonsen's media directory 518 provides a context of the content item that is to be rendered. However, as noted above, Salmonsen fails to disclose a URI corresponding to this media directory, and fails to disclose communicating such a [non-existent] URI. As claimed in claim 22, the method includes receiving a URI that provides a context of a content item from an external controller; Salmonsen's media directory 518 is not received from an external controller, and specifically, a URI corresponding to the media directory 518 is not received from an external controller.

Additionally, because neither Weast nor Salmonsen teaches or suggests a URI corresponding to a context of a content item, the combination of Weast and Salmonsen cannot be said to teach or suggest determining and rendering a subsequent content item from the media server based on the context provided by such a [non-existent] URI.

Because the combination of Weast and Salmonsen fails to teach or suggest receiving an identification of a content item at a media server to be rendered and a URI corresponding to a context of the content item within the media server from an external controller, fails to teach or suggest receiving the context of the content item based on the URI, and fails to teach or suggest determining and rendering a subsequent content item from the media server based on the context, and because the cited text relied upon by the Examiner in support of this rejection does not provide these teachings, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 22-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Weast and Salmonsen is unfounded, and should be reversed by the Board.

Claims 2, 6, 10, 20, and 22-27

The combination of Weast and Salmonsen fails to teach or suggest receiving the URI together with an objectID representative of the content item, as specifically claimed in claims 2 and 6, and fails to teach or suggest processing such an objectID, as specifically claimed in claim 10. Claims 20 and 22, upon which claims 23-28 include similar features.

In support of this rejection, the Examiner notes that the "media directory 518 stores Uniform Resource Identifiers (URIs) that identify content resources" (Office action, page 8, lines 3-5; page 11, lines 13-14; page 14, last paragraph; page 16, lines 6-8). While this statement may be correct, it has no bearing on the claimed feature of receiving an objectID together with the URI.

Because the Examiner has failed to identify where the combination of Weast and Salmonsen discloses receiving the URI together with an objectID representative of the content item, and because the Examiner's basis in support of this rejection is immaterial to this claimed feature, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 2, 6, 10, 20, and 22-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Weast and Salmonsen is unfounded, and should be reversed by the Board.

Claims 3-4, 7-8, 11-12, and 21

The combination of Weast and Salmonsen fails to teach or suggest providing a ProtocolInfo string referring to the content item and the organizational context for enabling the combination to retrieve a further URI representative of the content item, as specifically claimed in claims 3 and 7, upon which claims 4 and 8 depend. Claim 11, upon which claim 12 depends, and claim 21 include similar features.

The Examiner asserts that Salmonsen provides this teaching at paragraphs [0050] and [0125]. This assertion is incorrect. At the cited text, Salmonsen discloses:

"In some embodiments, the serial controller of the interface controller 210 can support a Serial Peripheral Interface (SPI) protocol that defines a full-duplex, synchronous, character-oriented data channel between master and slave devices using a four-wire interface. The master interface operates in broadcast mode with the slave interface activated using a select signal. The SPI operation mode converts simple parallelserial data to stream serial data between memory and a peripheral." (Salmonsen [0050].)

"Referring to FIG. 6, a use case diagram illustrates functionality of an audio-visual system that uses an emulator interface. The audio-visual system 600 includes a server 610 that is capable of executing on a processor and an emulator-enabled media player 612. The server 610 manages accessing and streaming of content to the emulator-enabled media player 612. The emulator-enabled media player 612 receives content from the server 610 and performs or presents the content. In a particular embodiment, the audio-visual system 600 can be a video system that plays

video content from multiple sources on an emulator-enabled DVD player."
(Salmonsen [0125].)

As is clearly evident, nowhere in the cited text does Salmonsen disclose providing a
ProtocolInfo string referring to the content item and the organizational context for
enabling the combination to retrieve a further URI representative of the content item,
as asserted by the Examiner. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully maintain that
the rejection of claims 3-4, 7-8, 11-12, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Weast
and Salmonsen is unfounded, and should be reversed by the Board.

Claims 13-18, 20-21 and 24

The combination of Weast and Salmonsen fails to teach or suggest that the
URI corresponding to the content directory is received from a UPnP Control Point, as
specifically claimed in claim 13, upon which claims 14-18, and 20-21 depend, and
claim 24.

The Examiner asserts, in the rejection of claim 13, that Salmonsen provides
this teaching, and in the rejection of claim 24 that Weast provides this teaching, but
fails to identify where either Weast or Salmonsen teaches or suggests that a UPnP
Control Point communicates a directory, and in particular, fails to identify where either
Weast or Salmonsen teaches or suggests that a UPnP Control Point communicates a
URI corresponding to a directory.

In the rejection of claim 24, for example, the Examiner merely states that
Weast discloses "a UPnP control point to discern the media contents available from
the various UPnP media servers, and the various UPnP media renderers present in a
network domain" (Office action, page 17, lines 3-5). While this statement may be
correct, it has no bearing on the claimed feature that a URI corresponding to the
content directory is received from a UPnP Control Point.

Accordingly, because the Examiner has failed to identify where the combination of Weast and Salmonsen teaches or suggests receiving a URI corresponding to a content directory from a UPnP Control Point, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 13-18 and 20-21 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Weast and Salmonsen is unfounded, and should be reversed by the Board.

Claims 4, 8, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)
over Weast, Salmonsen, and Saulpaugh

Claims 4, 8, and 12

Claims 4, 8, and 12 are dependent upon claims 3, 7, and 11, which are dependent upon claims 1, 5, and 9, and in this rejection, the Examiner relies on the combination of Weast and Salmonsen for teaching or suggesting each of the elements of claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, and 11. As noted above, the combination of Weast and Salmonsen fails to teach or suggest the elements of claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, and 11. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully maintain that the rejection of claims 4, 8, and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) that relies on the combination of Weast and Salmonsen for teaching or suggesting the elements of claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, and 11 is unfounded, and should be reversed by the Board.

CONCLUSIONS

Because the Examiner has failed to identify where the combination of Weast and Salmonsen teaches or suggests receiving a URI that is representative of a content directory, or a content directory description, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's rejections of claims 1-18 and 20-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be reversed by the Board, and the claims be allowed to pass to issue.

Because the Examiner has failed to identify where the combination of Weast and Salmonsen teaches or suggests each of the elements of claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 20, 21, 22, and 24, as detailed above, the applicants respectfully request that the Examiner's rejection of claims 2-4, 6-8, 10-18, and 20-27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be reversed by the Board, and the claims be allowed to pass to issue.

Respectfully submitted

/Robert M. McDermott/
Robert M. McDermott, Esq.
Registration Number 41,508
804-493-0707

Please direct all correspondence to:
Yan Glickberg, Esq.
Philips Intellectual Property and Standards
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001
914-332-0222

CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. A method of enabling a UPnP-compliant MediaRenderer-Control Point combination to use an organizational context of a content item as represented in a UPnP Content Directory Service, the method comprising enabling the combination to receive a URI representative of a Content Directory Service description.

2. The method of claim 1, comprising enabling the combination to receive the URI together with an objectID representative of the content item.

3. The method of claim 1, comprising providing a ProtocolInfo string referring to the content item and the organizational context for enabling the combination to retrieve a further URI representative of the content item for being streamed using a streaming protocol.

4. The method of claim 3, wherein the streaming protocol is proprietary.

5. An electronic device comprising a UPnP-compliant MediaRenderer-Control Point combination configured to exploit an organizational context of a content item as represented in a UPnP Content Directory Service, the device being configured to process a URI representative of the Content Directory description.

6. The device of claim 5, configured to process an objectID, representative of the content item, together with the URI.

7. The device of claim 5, configured to process a ProtocolInfo string referring to the content item and the organizational context for enabling the combination to retrieve a further URI representative of the content item for being streamed using a streaming protocol.

8. The device of claim 7, configured to implement the streaming protocol that is proprietary.

9. Control software stored on a non-transient computer-readable medium for installation on and execution by a UPnP-compliant MediaRenderer-Control Point combination for enabling the MediaRenderer to exploit an organizational context of a content item as represented in a UPnP Content Directory Service, the software being configured to process a URI representative of the Content Directory Service description.

10. The control software of claim 9, configured to process an objectID, representative of the content item, together with the URI.

11. The control software of claim 9, configured to process a ProtocolInfo string referring to the content item and the organizational context for enabling the combination to retrieve a further URI representative of the content item for being streamed using a streaming protocol.

12. The control software of claim 11, configured to control to implement the streaming protocol that is proprietary.

13. A device comprising:

    a UPnP interface;

    a renderer that is configured to render content received from at least one media server; and

    a controller that is configured to control reception of the content from the media server;

    wherein:

the controller is configured to receive a URI via the UPnP interface from an external UPnP Control Point, for receiving a content directory from the media server that provides an organization context of an item of the content at the media server, and to control selection of at least one subsequent item of the content based on the content directory.

14. The device of claim 13, wherein the controller is configured as an other UPnP Control Point.

15. The device of claim 13, wherein the content directory corresponds to a UPnP Content Directory Service.

16. The device of claim 13, wherein the controller is configured to automatically select the subsequent item of the content upon conclusion of rendering the item.

17. The device of claim 16, wherein the controller automatically selects the subsequent item based on a random selection from a plurality of items identified in the content directory.

18. The device of claim 16, wherein the controller automatically selects the subsequent item based on a logical order of a plurality of items identified in the content directory.

19. (Canceled)

20. The device of claim 13, wherein the controller is configured to receive the URI together with an identifier of the item for rendering the item.

21. The device of claim 13, wherein the controller is configured to receive a UPnP ProtocolInfo string that refers to the item and the organizational context to facilitate receiving the item from the media server.

22. A method for execution on a UPnP media renderer comprising:

receiving an identification of a content item at a media server to be rendered, and a URI corresponding to a context of the content item within the media server, from an external controller,

receiving the content item from the media server based on the identification,

receiving the context of the content item based on the URI,

rendering the content item at the UPnP media renderer,

determining a subsequent content item at the media server to be rendered, based on the context, and

rendering the subsequent content item.

23. The method of claim 22, wherein the URI identifies a UPnP Content Directory Service description.

24. The method of claim 22, wherein the external controller corresponds to a UPnP Control Point.

25. The method of claim 22, wherein the context corresponds to a content directory at the media server.

26. The method of claim 25, wherein the determining of the subsequent content item is based on a random selection from a plurality of content items identified in the content directory.

27. The method of claim 25, wherein the determining of the subsequent content item is based on a logical order of a plurality of items identified in the content directory.

Appl. No. 10/562,872
Appeal Brief in Response
to final Office action of **30 July 2010**

Page 21 of 22

EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No evidence has been submitted that is relied upon by the appellant in this appeal.

Appl. No. 10/562,872
Appeal Brief in Response
to final Office action of **30 July 2010**

Page 22 of 22

RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

Appellant is not aware of any co-pending appeal or interference which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have any bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.